



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/590,339	08/23/2006	Hidehiko Shin	2006_1397A	6998
52349	7590	06/09/2009	EXAMINER	
WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK L.L.P. 1030 15th Street, N.W. Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			PHANTANA ANGKOOL, DAVID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2175	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/590,339	SHIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Phantana-angkool	2175	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

Art Unit: 2175

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: RCE filed on March 24th, 2008.
2. Claims 1-17 are pending claims.
3. Applicants amended claims 1, 12 and 16.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

4. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/24/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2175

7. **Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts, US# 5,801,696 in view of Whittenberger, US PG PUB# 2004/0176967 A1.**

As for independent claim 1:

Re claim 1, Roberts discloses a display process device operable to execute a program stored on a computer-readable medium that causes the display processing device to display screen on a display comprising:

an information storage section (storage device for example) storing screen definition information (385 and 390 for example) defining a correlation among a screen displayed on the display, an action corresponding to an instruction indicated in the screen (column 10, lines 16-26, and column 10, lines 32-41); a screen definition information interpretation section (100 for example) interpreting the screen definition information, generating a screen which is to be displayed on the display, and, in accordance with an instruction given thereto, issuing a first screen event for the action corresponding to the instruction; a first event conversion section (395 for example) converting the first screen event to a first device event, which may be interpreted and executed by a device resource retained by the display process device; and a device resource control section (360,370 for example) controlling the device resource based on the first device event converted in said first event conversion section (see figure 4 for example).

Roberts does not specifically show and an access instruction for having an access to a resource on the apparatus in which an application is operable. In the same field of endeavor Whittenberger teaches mapping entities between a plurality of business applications. Whittenberger further shows an engine (Fig. 2# 200) which relates entities from one system to another in Para. 0026 and teaches a dynamic user interface for configuring a plurality of business systems 0047-0048). Accordingly it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention was made to modify the method as shown by Roberts to incorporate the mapping entity engine as taught by Whittenberger, thus improving efficiency by integrating a plurality of computer applications and generating a dynamic user interface (Whittenberger, 0001 and 0003).

As for dependent claim 2:

Re claim 2, Roberts discloses a *display process device, wherein the device resource control section*

Art Unit: 2175

issues a result of a modification in a screen caused by the device resource control section controlling said device resource, based on the first device event, as a second device event (see column 10 lines 51-57 according to the numbering in the middle for example), and further comprises a second event conversion section for converting the second device event to a second screen event, which may be interpreted and executed by said screen definition information interpretation section, and said screen definition information interpretation section modifies a screen, which is to be displayed on a display, based on the second screen event converted in the second event conversion section (see column 10 lines 47-55 for example).

As for dependent claim 3:

Re claim 3, Roberts discloses a display process device, wherein said device resource control section issues a result of a modification in the screen caused by the device resource control section controlling said device resource, based on the first device event, as a second device event, and said device resource control section further comprises a second event conversion section for directly converting the second device event to a screen which is to be displayed on the display (see column 10 lines 47-57 for example).

As for dependent claim 4:

Re claim 4, Roberts discloses a *display process device, further comprising a view section communicating to said first event conversion section the first screen event issued by said screen definition information interpretation section* (see 310 for example).

As for dependent claim 5:

Re claim 5, Roberts discloses a *display process device, further comprising a view section communicating to the first event conversion section said first screen event issued by said screen definition information interpretation section, and for giving to said second event conversion section said second device event issued by said device resource control section* (see 310 for example).

As for dependent claim 6:

Re claim 6, Roberts discloses a *display process device, further comprising a view section communicating to the first event conversion section said first screen event issued by said screen definition information*

Art Unit: 2175

interpretation section, and communicating to said second event conversion section said second device event issued by said device resource control section (see 310 for example).

As for dependent claim 7:

Re claim 7, Roberts discloses a *display process device, wherein the screen definition information is updated via said screen definition information interpretation section* (see column 10 lines 20-24 for example).

As for dependent claim 8:

Re claim 8, Roberts discloses a *display process device, wherein said screen definition information interpretation section is updated via said view section* (see column 10 lines 3-5 for example).

As for dependent claim 9:

Re claim 9, Roberts discloses a *display process device, wherein said first event conversion section is updated via the view section* (see column 10 lines 3-5 for example).

As for dependent claim 10:

Re claim 10, Roberts discloses a *display process device, wherein said second event conversion section is updated via the view section* (see column 10 lines 3-5 for example).

As for dependent claim 11:

Re claim 11, Roberts discloses a *display process device, wherein said second event conversion section is updated via the view section* (see column 10 lines 3-5 for example).

As for independent claim 12:

Re claim 12, Roberts discloses a *display process method for displaying a screen on a display comprising: an interpretation step (at storage device for example) interpreting a predetermined screen definition information defining a correlation among a screen displayed on the display, an action corresponding to an instruction indicated in the screen, and generating a screen which is to be displayed on the display; a first issuance step (at 100 for example) interpreting the screen definition information, and for issuing a first screen event for an action corresponding to the instruction; a first conversion step (at 395 for example) converting the first screen event to a first device event, which may be interpreted and executed by a predetermined device resource; and a control step (at 360,370 for*

Art Unit: 2175

example) controlling the device resource based on the first device event converted by the first conversion step (see figure 4 for example).

Roberts does not specifically show and an access instruction for having an access to a resource on the apparatus in which an application is operable. In the same field of endeavor Whittenberger teaches mapping entities between a plurality of business applications. Whittenberger further shows an engine (Fig. 2# 200) which relates entities from one system to another in Para. 0026 and teaches a dynamic user interface for configuring a plurality of business systems 0047-0048). Accordingly it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention was made to modify the method as shown by Roberts to incorporate the mapping entity engine as taught by Whittenberger, thus improving efficiency by integrating a plurality of computer applications and generating a dynamic user interface (Whittenberger, 0001 and 0003).

As for dependent claim 13:

Re claim 13, Roberts discloses *a display process method, further comprising: a second issuance step issuing a result of a modification in a screen caused by the control step controlling the device resource, based on the first device event, as a second device event; and a second conversion step converting the second device event to a second screen event, which is interpreted and executed in the interpretation step, wherein the interpretation step modifies a screen which is to be displayed on the display based on the second screen event* (see column 10 lines 47-57 for example).

As for dependent claim 14:

Re claim 14, Roberts discloses *a display process method, further comprising: a second issuance step issuing a result of a modification in a screen caused by the control step controlling the device resource, based on the first device event, as a second device event; and a second conversion step directly converting the second device event to a screen which is to be displayed* (see column 10 lines 47-57 for example).

As for dependent claim 15:

Re claim 15, Roberts discloses *a display process method further comprising a step updating the screen definition information* (see column 10 lines 20-24 for example).

Art Unit: 2175

As for independent claim 16:

Re claim 16 (as best understood), Roberts discloses a computer-readable program stored on a computer-readable storage medium for causing a display process device to execute a display process steps which causes a screen to be displayed, the program causing the display process device to execute:

an interpretation step (at storage device for example) interpreting a predetermined screen definition information defining a correlation among a screen displayed on a display, an action corresponding to an instruction indicated in the screen,_and generating a screen which is to be displayed on the display; a first issuance step (at 100 for example) interpreting the screen definition information, and issuing a first screen event for the action corresponding to the instruction; a first conversion step (at 395 for example) converting the first screen event to a first device event, which may be interpreted and executed by a predetermined device resource; and a control step (at 360,370 for example) controlling the device resource based on the first device event converted by the first conversion step (see figure 4 for example).

Roberts does not specifically show and an access instruction for having an access to a resource on the apparatus in which an application is operable. In the same field of endeavor Whittenberger teaches mapping entities between a plurality of business applications. Whittenberger further shows an engine (Fig. 2# 200) which relates entities from one system to another in Para. 0026 and teaches a dynamic user interface for configuring a plurality of business systems 0047-0048). Accordingly it would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time of the invention was made to modify the method as shown by Roberts to incorporate the mapping entity engine as taught by Whittenberger, thus improving efficiency by integrating a plurality of computer applications and generating a dynamic user interface (Whittenberger, 0001 and 0003).

As for dependent claim 17:

Re claim 17, Roberts discloses a computer-readable program further comprising: *a second issuance step for issuing a result of a modification in a screen caused by the control step controlling the device resource, based on the first device event, as a second device event; a second conversion step for converting the second device event to a second screen event, which may be interpreted and executed in*

Art Unit: 2175

the interpretation step; wherein the interpretation step modifies a screen which is to be displayed on the display based on the second screen event (see column 10 lines 47-57 for example).

8. **It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).**

The Examiner notes MPEP § 2144.01, that quotes *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968) as stating “in considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom.” Further MPEP 2123, states that “a reference may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill the art, including nonpreferred embodiments. *Merck & Co. v. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Phantana-angkool whose telephone number is 571-272-2673. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9:00-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 571-272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2175

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



DP

/David Phantana-angkool/
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/Adam L Basehoar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178